

MASSWILDLIFE HABITAT MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM (MHMGP)

FY2019 RANKING CRITERIA WORKSHEET

PROJECT TITLE:

☐ Private Landowner

☐ Land Trust/NGO

☐ Municipal

	CRITERIA	RANK
1	Project site protection status	
2	Project map	
3	Project budget	
4	Net benefit of management activities to game species	
5	Net benefit of management activities to State Wildlife Action Plan species	
6	Appropriateness of Treatment Unit / project size	
7	Landscape context	
8	Project feasibility	
9	Recreational activities open to public	
10	Partnerships and outreach	
11	Consideration of effects of climate change	
	Total	

MHMGP RANKING CRITERIA (TOTAL 175 POINTS)

- 1) MHMGP Management Area's protection status:
 - Conservation restriction, Town Conservation Land, or other permanent conservation status = **15** points
 - Agricultural Protection Restriction = **10** points
 - Chapter 61/61A or 61B = **5** points
 - Other temporary protection including previous LIP covenant = **2** points
 - No protection = **ineligible for program**
- 2) Application map(s) is detailed showing the location of the parcel and identifies MHMGP Treatment Unit areas area(s) ("TUs") that correspond to the TUs described in the application. Maps are provided at the appropriate scale for the TUs and show the context of the site within the landscape:
 - Excellent: Maps have detailed locus and outline MHMGP TUs; included maps are appropriate scaled, include legends, and delineate the TUs and the entire parcel. = **10** points
 - Satisfactory: Able to determine the location of the project, but map lacks some details = **5** points
 - Insufficient: Area not identified, maps confusing, or information missing = **0** points
- 3) The proposed budget is detailed, itemized, and reasonable for the services provided; shows the cost and explanation of the work needed to achieve project goals:
 - Detailed and itemized; quotes (if needed) are included for contracted work and costs are reasonable for proposed work. If NRCS rates are used, enough detail of the Treatment Unit habitat type(s) are provided and the work that is to be done is specified, and the correct NRCS rate is selected. = **10** points
 - Satisfactory, lacking detail and/or quotes (if needed) are not provided, but budget is reasonable for proposed work. If NRCS rates are used, not enough detail is provided to determine if correct rate(s) are selected, or incorrect rate is chosen. = **5** points
 - Insufficient budget information or proposed budget is unreasonable for the scope and scale of the proposed work = **0** points (earning 0 points on this criteria may result in the rejection of the entire application as MassWildlife reserves the right to reject all bids that it determines are not the best value overall for it to achieve the goals of the program.)
- 4) Net benefit to game species from proposed habitat management project (the grant ranking committee will be the final arbiter of the species list that is evaluated in relation to this criterion):
 - Habitat management provides high degree of net benefit to species that are hunted, fished, or trapped = **15** points
 - Habitat management provides moderate degree of net benefit to species that are hunted, fished, or trapped = **10** points
 - Habitat management provides minimal net benefit to species that are hunted, fished, or trapped = **5** points
 - No net benefit to species that are hunted, fished, and trapped = **0** points

- **Additional five (+5)** points for deer habitat management (e.g. young forest creation) that improve habitat on the site in [zones](#) 1, 5, 6, or northern section of zone 8 (zone 8 north of the Massachusetts Turnpike / Route 90).
 - **Additional ten (+10)** points for deer habitat management that improve productivity on the site in [zones](#) 2, 4N, and 4S.
- 5) Net benefit to [State Wildlife Action Plan \(SWAP\)](#) species from the proposed habitat management project. The grantee must provide an accurate list of SWAP species that will benefit from the proposed habitat management activity, the species occur in the vicinity of the TUs, and the species rely on the habitat type resulting from the proposed management (the grant ranking committee will be the final arbiter of the species list that is evaluated in relation to this criterion):
- Habitat management provides a high degree of net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list = **15** points
 - Habitat management provides a moderate degree of net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list = **10** points
 - Habitat management provides minimal net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list = **5** points
 - Habitat management provides no net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list or grantee fails to provide an accurate list of SWAP species that will benefit from the proposed habitat management activity, the species does not occur in the area, or does not rely on the habitat type = **0** points
 - **Additional five (+5)** points maximum for projects that benefit Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern Species as listed in the SWAP.
- 6) Treatment Unit area(s) (“TUs”) are at the appropriate scale(s) for species/habitat management:
- TUs are at the appropriate size(s) for the species/habitat being managed for = **20** points
 - TUs are partially appropriate, it supports some species or habitats, but not others; or some TUs are appropriately sized, but others are not = **10** points
 - TUs are not appropriate for the species/habitats being proposed to be managed = **0** points
- 7) Geographic and ecological landscape context of the proposed Treatment Unit area(s):
- TUs are highly complementary to local landscape features = **15** points
 - TUs are moderately complementary to local landscape features = **10** points
 - TUs are minimally complementary to local landscape = **5** points
 - TUs are not complementary to local landscape features = **0** points
- 8) Management objectives and tasks are likely to be achieved within the grant agreement period:
- Proposed management objectives and tasks are likely to be achieved within the grant agreement period = **20** points
 - Proposed management objectives and tasks may be achievable within the grant period but there may be limiting factors that would prohibit the management to be completed as proposed = **10** points

- Proposed management objectives and tasks are unlikely to be achieved within the grant agreement period = **0** points

9) Land is open to the public for the following activities (if property is open to hunting by permission, the landowner must provide a detailed description of the access and permission application process – e.g. # of hunters allowed, type of hunting allowed, application form, etc.). Failure to provide this information may result in no points for this criterion:

- Land is open to hunting, fishing, and trapping without any landowner or municipality restrictions = **25** points
- Land is open to a combination of hunting, fishing, and trapping with some restrictions: access to the property is limited due to landowner restrictions (permission is required; after review of criteria for permission, restrictions are considered low) = **20** points
- Land is open to a combination of hunting, fishing, and trapping with some restrictions: access to the property is limited due to landowner restrictions (permission is required; after review of criteria for permission, restrictions are considered moderate) = **15** points
- Land is open to a combination of hunting, fishing, and trapping with some restrictions: access to the property is limited due to landowner restrictions (permission is required; after review of criteria for permission, restrictions are considered high, or a fee is charged or membership is required for access) = **10** points
- Land is open to passive wildlife associated recreational activities and fishing, but not hunting and/or trapping due to landowner's or municipality policy = **5** points
- Land is not open to the public = **0** points

Modifiers:

- **Subtraction of 10%** of awarded points for loss of 5-20% of parcel size available for hunting due to legally mandated setbacks under state statute M.G.L. c. 131, § 58
- **Subtraction of 20%** of awarded points for loss of 20-40% of parcel size available for hunting due to legally mandated setbacks under state statute M.G.L. c. 131, § 58
- **Subtraction of 30%** of awarded points for loss of 40%+ of parcel size available for hunting due to legally mandated setbacks under state statute M.G.L. c. 131, § 58

10) The landowner has established partnerships with other organizations or individuals in the habitat management process to further enhance habitat management efforts and fully describes the nature of these partnerships in relation to the current proposal.

- The landowner has established partnerships/collaborates with other organizations or individuals in the habitat management activities described herein to substantially enhance habitat management = **10** points
- The landowner has established partnerships/collaborates with other organizations or individuals in the habitat management activities described herein to moderately enhance habitat management = **5** points
- The landowner has not established partnerships/collaborates with other organizations or individuals in the habitat management activities

described herein that resulted in significant enhancement to the habitat management = **0** points

11) Did the applicant address climate change in their proposal?

- The landowner addressed climate change in their proposal = **5** points
- The landowner did address climate change in their proposal = **0** points